

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION MEETING

APPROVED Minutes

November 19, 2020

Meeting occurred via WebEx Teleconferencing

Chair Ford called meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

Commissioners Present: Bob Ford (Chair), Lynda Earle (Vice Chair), Scott Markow (Vice Chair), Bianca Chang, Mabrooka Chaudhry, Joan Hash, Peter Hwang, Joshua Kaufmann, Leslie Salgado-Tamayo, Gabriel Terrasa, Kui Zhao, and Jonathon Di Pietro (Student Commissioner).

Staff Present: Yolanda was absent due to the death of her mother.

Legal Counsel: Melissa Goldmeier (by phone if needed)

Meeting Attendees Present: Mr. James Karantonis.

I. PUBLIC FORUM

Mr. James Karantonis introduced himself and wanted to observe how the commission works. He noted that he used to be on the commission.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Josh moved that the October minutes be approved and Joan seconded that. The motion passed unanimously.

III. CHAIR'S REPORT – BOB

Bob noted that this is Native American Heritage Month and recalled that he and Chaunta had attended a beautiful event in honor of Native Americans last year. He also stated that it is Transgender Day of Remembrance in this month. He also gave condolences to Yolanda on behalf of the Commission on the passing of her mother. He also congratulated Chaunta on her recent marriage. Bob noted that he is a member of COVE, Coalition for Opposing Violence and Extremism, and that they are holding a forum on December at 7pm on Human Rights Day to celebrate the 72nd anniversary of the United Nations' Human Rights Declaration in 1948. More information is available on the HR website.

Bob mentioned an issue brought to his attention by Scott regarding letting members of the public speak. Scott noted that since the public forum is set aside to welcome members of the public to join us, if a member of the public may wish to speak outside of the allotted time, we can make a motion to let them speak with a 2nd and commission approval. Bob noted that he believes that that has been past practice.

Lastly, Bob announced that after two terms a Commission Chair, he will not seek another term and thanked everyone for their ongoing support and cooperation. He noted that he looks forward to working with the newly elected officials in the upcoming year.

IV. EXECUTIVE SECRETARY REPORT

Chaunta gave the report in the absence of the Administrator

She reported that there are 6 pending cases, 5 EEOC and 1 Housing. There were 4 new cases, 22 inquiries and 1 closed case. There were 2 HBI cases reported in October, both anti-Black. Lynda

requested details on these and Chaunta reported that in both cases the “N” word was used against the targeted individual. Chaunta noted that Yolanda will be revising the monthly report and it will be mailed out.

V. STUDENT REPORT

Jonathan reported that he has been in communication with the Director of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion to work out receipt of HBI data from the school system. He was unable to use the original data. He has also been in contact with Central Office and the Office of Legal Council to seek data resources. In addition, Jonathan is doing independent research on his own to look for other useful sources. Jonathan also reported that he is also advocating for the Student Demonstration Bill and looking at legal issues related to that.

VI. COMMITTEE REPORTS

a. **Nominating:** No report.

b. **Awards:**

Bianca thanked the HR staff, including Marla Moore, for helping the first virtual award event a success. She thanked her award committee with special thanks to her Co-Chair Bianca suggests that next year we work hard to send the program link out much earlier in order to increase audience participation. Lynda asked if the program had been taped for later viewing. Chaunta noted that it had been taped and put on a drop box after being reviewed by POI staff. Lynda also suggested that now that we have added a Student category that we get information out to the county schools very early to solicit candidates. Bianca agreed and also noted that the nomination form be updated to show the 3rd category of Student.

c. **Outreach:**

Kui mentioned the Chinese Outreach held on the prior Sunday. Chaunta hosted and Kui did the presentation. Kui translated. Chaunta noted that it went very well. Kui got feedback from the Chinese community that they wanted the hate bias crimes reported to the Human Rights Commission as well. Chaunta noted that she has been designated as a middle person working in conjunction with the Police department.
No report

d. **Civic Participation (Census/Voting):** No report

e. **Hate Crimes:** No report

f. **Legislation:**

Scott submitted a written report but wanted to highlight one item in the report which was Council Bill CB63-2020 introduced by Opal Jones on 11/2 which prohibits Ho Co employees from enforcing immigration laws or disclosing citizenship status. He noted that a public hearing was held. He will provide an update at the December meeting. Leslie added that she and other groups had attended a meeting on the bill to talk about amendments and she believes that the bill will pass. Leslie said that the bill is very similar to CB 9 which was done about 3 years ago but a little weaker.

g. **Immigration:**

Bob noted that all commissioners will have time to speak on this important issue. Bob requested that Issue 2, addition of immigration status to county code, be addressed first. Josh noted that it would be

easier for Commissioners if Chaunta could share the screen and show the email sent by Joan summarizing all proposed language for upcoming motions which was summarized in an email sent on November 17th at 6:38pm. Joan requested that authors of the language give an overview to commissioners prior to any formal motion or vote. On Issue 2, presenters were Scott, Lynda and Joshua. **Three motions were presented for consideration: (1) Adding immigration status as a protected class to each cause of action in the county code in a way that is not in conflict with any state and federal laws; (2) To not support adding immigration status to the county code; and (3) Decline to take a position.** Scott pointed out to the Commissioners and Lynda concurred that if commissioners wanted to, they could choose to just select a subset of classes to apply this to. Leslie noted that since the language has the phrase "to the maximum extent possible" that she would not change the language. Joan agreed with Leslie. Lynda noted that there was a referendum on the ballot on employment but Josh pointed that only applied to county employees. Peter made a motion to move forward with the motion to support adding immigration status to the code and Lynda seconded the motion. A verbal roll call vote was taken and the **motion passed with 10 yea's and one abstention.**

Next, the commissioners turned their attention to Issue 1, the termination of the ICE contract with HoCo DOC. There was extensive discussion on this issue. These notes capture the main points made with all conversation resident on the official electronic record.

Leslie requested that prior to the discussion of motion for Issue 1 that she be allowed to discuss the DHS/OIG report as well as the Ball Letter. All commissioners had previously been provided copies of both. She gave a summary of the findings including findings of illegal strip searches and failure to provide adequate meals among other things. She noted that County Executive Ball's letter appeared to be in conflict with the OIG findings and questioned if Mr. Kavanaugh was doing accurate reporting to Executive Ball. She asked that commissioners consider both documents in their deliberations.

Peter then asked, prior to discussion of motion language, what we would be doing with the specific language. Josh suggested that a letter to Executive Ball and the County Council accompany the report submittal. He also stated that the report should be in the public domain which everyone agreed with since we are a public commission. Lynda asked about the protocol for releasing the report. In response, Leslie read language directly from the county code which authorizes the commission any actions regarding communicating with the Executive and the Council including submission of reports and recommendations. In terms of how to proceed, after much discussion, it was agreed that rather than spending time parsing language for motions which may not pass, we find out which motions have support and after determining that, we then close on the exact language. Josh noted that whatever language is chosen should appear in the report. Peter, Bianca, Gabe and Scott all spoke up in favor of moving forward in this manner.

There were 5 possible actions shown for Issue 1. Step 1 is to pick the action and step 2 is to close on language. As a test of process, Bianca placed a motion on the floor to take no action. Joan seconded the option. Josh then placed a motion to table Bianca's motion with a second from Peter. Bianca then withdrew her motion. Leslie stated that she felt that the motion of taking no action after a 9-month study equated to taking no ownership of the issue. Lynda pointed out that her language had the stipulation of **"at this time"** to indicate that there had been some positive movement on the issue subsequent to our study. Josh noted that abuses by the State are so much more egregious than abuses by private citizens and represent serious abuse. Joan noted that she would want to do more than read the report but have an opportunity to speak with the organization which was subject of the review and individual research including possibility of reviewing correspondence supporting the conclusions. Bob polled each commissioner on termination of the contract. Jonathan, our student commissioner, has no vote but went

on record in support of those voting to terminate the contract. **After polling, the motion to terminate the contract failed by a 6 to 5 vote. A motion was then put on the floor to support the change in county policy which would detain only violent offenders. The motion carried by a vote of 7 to 4.**

Scott then made a motion that the two passed motions (For Issue 1 & Issue 2) be put into the Immigration report and that the report be made public. Gabe seconded the motion. It was agreed that language acknowledging that commissioners had access to both the OIG report and the Ball letter as resource material be added to the final report as well.

Jonathan asked if his position could be included in the formal report but it was noted that individual votes are not included in our formal reports and Lynda reinforced the point that once a vote is taken and a position taken, the report is a unified report based on the majority vote.

Leslie made a motion that in the cover letter going forward to the Executive and the council, include acknowledgement that the members had access to the OIG report. Gabe seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Peter requested that Chaunta find out if there are any POI issues regarding transmission of the cover letter and report. She agreed to do so. Joan noted that for prior reports/research, the cover letter and report as a package are transmitted from the Chair (Bob) to the HR Administrator for posting on the website and delivery to the Executive and the County Council.

VII. NEW BUSINESS/ANNOUNCEMENTS :

Kui noted that the ON-THE-TABLE sessions sponsored by the Department of Zoning to support the county's Master Plan were being held. Several commissioners were facilitators.

VIII. CLOSED SESSION

Scott made a motion to go into closed session seconded by Joan to obtain legal advice and protect the privacy of involved individuals. The motion carried unanimously. Closed session was called to discuss two appeal cases.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

- Motion to adjourn the meeting made by Bob and seconded . All Commissioners voted in favor of the meeting being adjourned.
- Meeting was Adjourned at 9:48 pm.

Taylor, Chaunta L.

From: Scott Markow <scott.markow.hrc@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 21, 2020 3:56 PM
To: Joshua Kaufman
Cc: Robert Ford; Joan Hash; lyhil@aol.com; akoorbam@gmail.com; cchangb@gmail.com; gterrasa@tslawmd.com; hrc; jonathon.dipietro1@gmail.com; kui_zhao@yahoo.com; lpsalgado@comcast.net; Goldmeier, Melissa; phwang@sungandhwang.com; Sonnier, Yolanda
Subject: Re: Revisiting 11/19/20 Meeting

Josh,

I would be happy to further clarify my position on the contract and the IG report, but I believe the best forum to do that is a public meeting, as opposed to continuing the debate over email, which may not be easily accessible to the public. I feel that the IG report is a separate issue that can and should be considered by the entire Commission, whether at our next meeting in December or earlier if we wish to call a special meeting.

We have had special meetings in the past for important issues that have arisen. The most recent I can recall was during the summer of 2019, when we had a special telephone conference meeting to discuss comments that the Commission wished to submit in response to a proposed HUD regulation, and which could not wait until our next regular meeting due to a deadline to file comments. This issue does not have such a deadline, but I would be willing to attend a special meeting because of its urgency.

Thanks,
Scott

On Sat, Nov 21, 2020 at 3:30 PM Joshua Kaufman <joshuakaufman71@gmail.com> wrote:
Greetings colleagues, I hope all is well.

There are three issues here, so I would like to speak to them separately.

Obviously, I did not vote in favor of the motion in question. However, while this situation does present a challenging precedent, doesn't it set a worse one if someone is forced to go along with a decision that they end up disagreeing with? I think Bob is only partially correct. We need to conform to the OMA, but that act allows us to call a public meeting at any time (with proper notice). It does not have to be our normally scheduled meeting.

On the IG report. I am admittedly struggling to understand Joan's position. We have a copy of the full IG report. We do not need any additional data nor do we need to conduct our own investigation. The IGs are experts in their field and they have done that on behalf of us. Their findings could not be clearer:

"Our December 2019 unannounced inspection of HCDC identified violations of ICE detention standards that **threatened the health, safety, and rights of detainees**. Although HCDC generally complied with 2011 PBNDS communication standards, it **did not meet the standards for detainee searches, food service, and record requirements for segregation and medical grievances**. We determined **HCDC violated detention standards by excessively stripsearching low custody detainees** leaving their housing unit to attend activities within the facility. Although HCDC received a waiver from ICE related to strip searches, HCDC's current practice of strip-searching low custody detainees without documented reasonable suspicion exceeds the parameters of the waiver and contradicts facility policy. In addition, HCDC failed to provide detainees with **two hot meals per day**, as required. For those in segregation, HCDC did not

document that detainees received three meals a day or **daily medical visits, as required**. Further, HCDC did not properly document the handling of detainee medical grievances."

I have to admit I am also struggling to understand Scott's point that the IG report is not related to the contact. The IG report was an investigation into the administration of the contact. How is that possibly a separate issue? This commission had a clear and straightforward opportunity to address these issues and we manifestly failed to do so.

Finally, I want to support Lynda's suggestion that we invite the coalition to our next meeting. That is thoughtful, classy and respectful. I am sorry that I did not think of that myself.

Regards,
Josh

On Sat, Nov 21, 2020 at 12:24 PM Robert Ford <bottles@comcast.net> wrote:

All,

We will have to follow our procedures to send to the CE and Council the Immigration Committee report with the motions like we voted to. Scott can draft the letter if he chooses to help with that task. We should discuss the Human Rights abuses at the Detention Center, the OIG Report and maybe another meeting with Jack Kavanaugh to see what has been done to remedy the situation and what our response to that should be. Joan if she wants to can work on this issue.

Any member can make a motion at the next meeting to revisit this issue but open meeting laws limit what we can do outside of our scheduled meetings. If the Coalition wants to appear at the Public Forum in December they can but they will be held to our original time limit of 5 minutes since I have given them ample time in the past. I disagree that we rushed this decision. We have worked on this issue all year and had multihour discussions at our October and November meetings.

Bob Ford

On 11/21/2020 10:20 AM, Joan Hash wrote:

Linda, I agree with everything that Scott stated below. Agreements were made in the meeting and motions put up and officially voted on. I think it sets a very bad precedent. My opinion is that the decision was made to add the language to our report and make it publicly available and we should proceed to do that.

My question is, as much as I would like to further explore the OIG report, do I need to go through ICE for that engagement and any requests for additional data from the supporting notes since the report is officially theirs or could we go straight to the HOCO DOC with our questions. I really think before we put the motion on the floor for a vote as to whether we further explore this or not that

we find out what would be made available to us and from whom. If the Chair agrees, I would volunteer to make an inquiry at the HOCO DOC based on your note. I think we need to know this prior to consideration of opening up another task.

In any case, any motion can be put on the floor at our next meeting I'm sure, if you prefer to do that.

We need to proceed with the release of the report as agreed upon in the meeting.

Scott, it would be appreciated if you would ytake a stab at drafting a letter.

Thank you both for your input.

-----Original Message-----

From: Scott Markow <scott.markow.hrc@gmail.com>

To: Lynda Hill <lyhil@aol.com>

Cc: bottles@comcast.net <bottles@comcast.net>; joybert@aol.com <joybert@aol.com>; akoorbam@gmail.com <akoorbam@gmail.com>; cchangb@gmail.com <cchangb@gmail.com>; gterrasa@tslawmd.com <gterrasa@tslawmd.com>; hrc@howardcountymd.gov <hrc@howardcountymd.gov>; jonathon.dipietro1@gmail.com <jonathon.dipietro1@gmail.com>; joshuakaufman71@gmail.com <joshuakaufman71@gmail.com>; kui_zhao@yahoo.com <kui_zhao@yahoo.com>; lpsalgado@comcast.net <lpsalgado@comcast.net>; mgoldmeier@howardcountymd.gov <mgoldmeier@howardcountymd.gov>; phwang@sungandhwang.com <phwang@sungandhwang.com>; ysonnier@howardcountymd.gov <ysonnier@howardcountymd.gov>

Sent: Sat, Nov 21, 2020 9:47 am

Subject: Re: Revisiting 11/19/20 Meeting

Everyone,

First, I want to thank all the Commissioners for a very spirited and courteous debate at our meeting. All of the Commissioners made very persuasive arguments that have kept me thinking about these issues even after the conclusion of our meeting. Second, I want to thank my fellow committee members for putting together such a thorough report. Finally, I want to thank Lynda for her very thoughtful and articulate comments made in her email below. What follows is my personal thoughts in response to Lynda's comments.

Regarding whether the Commission can reconsider its position on any issue, my understanding is that any Commissioner can make a motion regarding any issue at any of our meetings, even to reconsider a prior decision. While it may not set a great precedent to continually revisit prior decisions, it is certainly possible to do so, and in certain cases may be warranted.

I do not agree that we should rescind our collective decision as a Commission to support the change in policy regarding the ICE contract. The fact that this is current policy does not change the fact that the Commission voted to support the policy change. The issues are still in flux and our decision could influence further action. For example, the County Council may decide to codify this policy so that it cannot be easily rescinded by the next administration or the County may decide to amend the contract to include the policy in the contract. That being said, I would support an amendment to our motion 1 that says that this is our position "at this time". Personally, I would like to see how things play out under the new policy and with the new federal administration over the course of the next several months, and possibly revisit our recommendation at

that time. And, I would be willing to make a statement to that effect in the cover letter that we send to the County Executive and the County Council if that is acceptable to the majority of Commissioners. To that end, if Joan would like me to do so, I am willing to take a first crack at drafting a cover letter to the County Executive and County Council with our report. I can circulate it first within the immigration committee for comment and, once approved by the committee, then to the full Commission.

In addition, I have also been very troubled by the inspector general's report about the conditions at the Jessup prison. I believe that this is a separate issue and that we may have given this issue less attention than it deserved at our meeting because we were so focused on the issue of whether to terminate the contract. To me, it is not inconsistent to say that you support keeping the contract in place with the policy change but that you also condemn the conditions at the prison, if the inspector general's report (which we have not actually seen) is true. Personally, I think this is an issue that demands our further consideration and attention and I would like to see a statement in our cover letter that addresses this issue once we have the time to debate and vote on it. Since our regular December meeting will be pushing up against the winter holidays, if the Chair of the Commission believes it would be helpful, I, for one, would be willing to attend another meeting before our next regular meeting to discuss the inspector general's report as a separate issue. I do not think we should spend time that meeting revisiting whether the contract should be terminated. But, I do think it is important that we give the inspector general's report the separate attention it deserves.

Finally, I think it may be worth preparing a cover letter to the Coalition with a copy of our report as a courtesy.

Thanks,
Scott

On Fri, Nov 20, 2020 at 10:32 PM Lynda Hill <lyhil@aol.com> wrote:

Greetings Everyone,

I have been giving some thought to our meeting last night and there are several issues that I would like to bring up with you.

I would like to know if we have ever reconvened on an issue? The reason I am asking is because upon reflection, I do not think that the motion that carried for Issue 1 should be included with our report because it is the current policy and does not add anything or recommend anything different than what already exists. I think Leslie made that extremely valid point.

Also, I believe that we have an opportunity to do additional good work by giving the Office of Inspector General's Report individual attention. I think we were very focused on our goal to write clear motions with good language and on taking the vote, so the report was not a separate item on the agenda. Although Leslie did bring it up, it was in relation to the issues that we were already considering.

I think that we should consider whether we need to make some statement about the treatment of the undocumented detainees at HCDC. We may be remiss in our duties if we don't.

Additionally, It seems that some believe that issue 1, is mutually exclusive such that we cannot also denounce inhumane behavior while having voted not to cancel the contract. I do not think that is the case because whatever the language of a contract, there still is and should be an expectation that everyone, including undocumented detainees, are treated with decency, respect, fairness and in a humane manner. Nevertheless, if that is the perception of anyone, I would rather move to

rescind the carried motion regarding Issue I, which is not new policy and put both remaining motions back on the floor so that our voice is stronger as we address the unacceptable treatment that occurred at HCDC.

I would also respectfully suggest that the next time we have multiple motions on such an important issue that we utilize two days if possible. One day just to finalize language and to have full discussions at a time when we don't also have hearings and the next day to vote at our regular meeting.

Finally, I think at some point we should invite the Coalition back so that we are able to thank them for bringing the issue to us. It wasn't the County Executive or the County Council who asked us to do this; but it was the Coalition, so as a courtesy, I think we should invite them back or reach out directly in some way. (I think Peter suggested that previously).

I appreciate you listening to my humble opinion and would respectfully request that if possible, we reconvene to consider a motion to rescind the previously passed motion for issue I, because it is already policy and offers nothing different. Further, that we put the remaining two motions back on the floor for a another vote. I think some of us vacillated towards the end because what each person had to offer was so moving and valuable.

This is what my spirit is telling me to offer with the understanding that we have already voted, I defer to the Chairs.

Sincerely,

Lynda Earle

Taylor, Chaunta L.

From: Robert Ford <bottles@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, November 21, 2020 4:53 PM
To: Joshua Kaufman
Cc: Joan Hash; scott.markow.hrc@gmail.com; lyhil@aol.com; akoorbam@gmail.com; cchangb@gmail.com; gterrasa@tslawmd.com; hrc; jonathon.dipietro1@gmail.com; kui_zhao@yahoo.com; lpsalgado@comcast.net; Goldmeier, Melissa; phwang@sungandhwang.com; Sonnier, Yolanda
Subject: Re: Revisiting 11/19/20 Meeting

Majority rule is not a challenging precedent. This is not a jury trial that must be unanimous. We are not forcing anyone to go along with a decision they disagree with. Everyone's votes are on the record. The Howard County Human Rights Commission voted for these two motions 7-4 and 9-2 to be added to the Immigration Committee report and sent to the County Executive and Council. Back and forth emails do not take the place of official HRC meetings.

Bob

On 11/21/2020 3:30 PM, Joshua Kaufman wrote:

Greetings colleagues, I hope all is well.

There are three issues here, so I would like to speak to them separately.

Obviously, I did not vote in favor of the motion in question. However, while this situation does present a challenging precedent, doesn't it set a worse one if someone is forced to go along with a decision that they end up disagreeing with? I think Bob is only partially correct. We need to conform to the OMA, but that act allows us to call a public meeting at any time (with proper notice). It does not have to be our normally scheduled meeting.

On the IG report. I am admittedly struggling to understand Joan's position. We have a copy of the full IG report. We do not need any additional data nor do we need to conduct our own investigation. The IGs are experts in their field and they have done that on behalf of us. Their findings could not be clearer:

"Our December 2019 unannounced inspection of HCDC identified violations of ICE detention standards that **threatened the health, safety, and rights of detainees**. Although HCDC generally complied with 2011 PBNDS communication standards, it **did not meet the standards for detainee searches, food service, and record requirements for segregation and medical grievances**. We determined HCDC **violated detention standards by excessively stripsearching low custody detainees** leaving their housing unit to attend activities within the facility. Although HCDC received a waiver from ICE related to strip searches, HCDC's current practice of strip-searching low custody detainees without documented reasonable suspicion exceeds the parameters of the waiver and contradicts facility policy. In addition, HCDC failed to provide detainees with **two hot meals per day**, as required. For those in segregation, HCDC did not document that detainees received three meals a day or **daily medical visits, as required**. Further, HCDC did not properly document the handling of detainee medical grievances."

I have to admit I am also struggling to understand Scott's point that the IG report is not related to the contact. The IG report was an investigation into the administration of the contact. How is that possibly a separate issue? This commission had a clear and straightforward opportunity to address these issues and we manifestly failed to do so.

Finally, I want to support Lynda's suggestion that we invite the coalition to our next meeting. That is thoughtful, classy and respectful. I am sorry that I did not think of that myself.

Regards,
Josh

On Sat, Nov 21, 2020 at 12:24 PM Robert Ford <bottles@comcast.net> wrote:

All,

We will have to follow our procedures to send to the CE and Council the Immigration Committee report with the motions like we voted to. Scott can draft the letter if he chooses to help with that task. We should discuss the Human Rights abuses at the Detention Center, the OIG Report and maybe another meeting with Jack Kavanaugh to see what has been done to remedy the situation and what our response to that should be. Joan if she wants to can work on this issue.

Any member can make a motion at the next meeting to revisit this issue but open meeting laws limit what we can do outside of our scheduled meetings. If the Coalition wants to appear at the Public Forum in December they can but they will be held to our original time limit of 5 minutes since I have given them ample time in the past. I disagree that we rushed this decision. We have worked on this issue all year and had multihour discussions at our October and November meetings.

Bob Ford

On 11/21/2020 10:20 AM, Joan Hash wrote:

Linda, I agree with everything that Scott stated below. Agreements were made in the meeting and motions put up and officially voted on. I think it sets a very bad precedent. My opinion is that the decision was made to add the language to our report and make it publicly available and we should proceed to do that.

My question is, as much as I would like to further explore the OIG report, do I need to go through ICE for that engagement and any requests for additional data from the supporting notes since the report is officially theirs or could we go straight to the HOCO DOC with our questions. I really think before we put the motion on the floor for a vote as to whether we further explore this or not that we find out what would be made available to us and from whom. If the Chair agrees, I would volunteer to make an inquiry

at the HOCO DOC based on your note. I think we need to know this prior to consideration of opening up another task.

In any case, any motion can be put on the floor at our next meeting I'm sure, if you prefer to do that.

We need to proceed with the release of the report as agreed upon in the meeting.

Scott, it would be appreciated if you would ytake a stab at drafting a letter.

Thank you both for your input.

-----Original Message-----

From: Scott Markow <scott.markow.hrc@gmail.com>

To: Lynda Hill <lyhil@aol.com>

Cc: bottles@comcast.net <bottles@comcast.net>; joybert@aol.com <joybert@aol.com>; akoorbam@gmail.com <akoorbam@gmail.com>; cchangb@gmail.com <cchangb@gmail.com>; gterrasa@tslawmd.com <gterrasa@tslawmd.com>; hrc@howardcountymd.gov <hrc@howardcountymd.gov>; jonathon.dipietro1@gmail.com <jonathon.dipietro1@gmail.com>; joshuakaufman71@gmail.com <joshuakaufman71@gmail.com>; kui_zhao@yahoo.com <kui_zhao@yahoo.com>; lpsalgado@comcast.net <lpsalgado@comcast.net>; mgoldmeier@howardcountymd.gov <mgoldmeier@howardcountymd.gov>; phwang@sungandhwang.com <phwang@sungandhwang.com>; ysonnier@howardcountymd.gov <ysonnier@howardcountymd.gov>

Sent: Sat, Nov 21, 2020 9:47 am

Subject: Re: Revisiting 11/19/20 Meeting

Everyone,

First, I want to thank all the Commissioners for a very spirited and courteous debate at our meeting. All of the Commissioners made very persuasive arguments that have kept me thinking about these issues even after the conclusion of our meeting. Second, I want to thank my fellow committee members for putting together such a thorough report. Finally, I want to thank Lynda for her very thoughtful and articulate comments made in her email below. What follows is my personal thoughts in response to Lynda's comments.

Regarding whether the Commission can reconsider its position on any issue, my understanding is that any Commissioner can make a motion regarding any issue at any of our meetings, even to reconsider a prior decision. While it may not set a great precedent to continually revisit prior decisions, it is certainly possible to do so, and in certain cases may be warranted.

I do not agree that we should rescind our collective decision as a Commission to support the change in policy regarding the ICE contract. The fact that this is current policy does not change the fact that the Commission voted to support the policy change. The issues are still in flux and our decision could influence further action. For example, the County Council may decide to codify this policy so that it cannot be easily rescinded by the next administration or

the County may decide to amend the contract to include the policy in the contract. That being said, I would support an amendment to our motion 1 that says that this is our position "at this time". Personally, I would like to see how things play out under the new policy and with the new federal administration over the course of the next several months, and possibly revisit our recommendation at that time. And, I would be willing to make a statement to that effect in the cover letter that we send to the County Executive and the County Council if that is acceptable to the majority of Commissioners. To that end, if Joan would like me to do so, I am willing to take a first crack at drafting a cover letter to the County Executive and County Council with our report. I can circulate it first within the immigration committee for comment and, once approved by the committee, then to the full Commission.

In addition, I have also been very troubled by the inspector general's report about the conditions at the Jessup prison. I believe that this is a separate issue and that we may have given this issue less attention than it deserved at our meeting because we were so focused on the issue of whether to terminate the contract. To me, it is not inconsistent to say that you support keeping the contract in place with the policy change but that you also condemn the conditions at the prison, if the inspector general's report (which we have not actually seen) is true. Personally, I think this is an issue that demands our further consideration and attention and I would like to see a statement in our cover letter that addresses this issue once we have the time to debate and vote on it. Since our regular December meeting will be pushing up against the winter holidays, if the Chair of the Commission believes it would be helpful, I, for one, would be willing to attend another meeting before our next regular meeting to discuss the inspector general's report as a separate issue. I do not think we should spend time that meeting revisiting whether the contract should be terminated. But, I do think it is important that we give the inspector general's report the separate attention it deserves.

Finally, I think it may be worth preparing a cover letter to the Coalition with a copy of our report as a courtesy.

Thanks,
Scott

On Fri, Nov 20, 2020 at 10:32 PM Lynda Hill <lyhil@aol.com> wrote:

Greetings Everyone,

I have been giving some thought to our meeting last night and there are several issues that I would like to bring up with you.

I would like to know if we have ever reconvened on an issue? The reason I am asking is because upon reflection, I do not think that the motion that carried for Issue 1 should be included with our report because it is the current policy and does not add anything or recommend anything different than what already exists. I think Leslie made that extremely valid point.

Also, I believe that we have an opportunity to do additional good work by giving the Office of Inspector General's Report individual attention. I think we were very focused on our goal to write clear motions with good language and on taking the vote, so the report was not a

separate item on the agenda. Although Leslie did bring it up; it was in relation to the issues that we were already considering.

I think that we should consider whether we need to make some statement about the treatment of the undocumented detainees at HCDC. We may be remiss in our duties if we don't.

Additionally, It seems that some believe that issue I, is mutually exclusive such that we cannot also denounce inhumane behavior while having voted not to cancel the contract. I do not think that is the case because whatever the language of a contract, there still is and should be an expectation that everyone, including undocumented detainees, are treated with decency, respect, fairness and in a humane manner. Nevertheless, if that is the perception of anyone, I would rather move to rescind the carried motion regarding Issue I, which is not new policy and put both remaining motions back on the floor so that our voice is stronger as we address the unacceptable treatment that occurred at HCDC.

I would also respectfully suggest that the next time we have multiple motions on such an important issue that we utilize two days if possible. One day just to finalize language and to have full discussions at a time when we don't also have hearings and the next day to vote at our regular meeting.

Finally, I think at some point we should invite the Coalition back so that we are able to thank them for bringing the issue to us. It wasn't the County Executive or the County Council who asked us to do this; but it was the Coalition, so as a courtesy, I think we should invite them back or reach out directly in some way. (I think Peter suggested that previously).

I appreciate you listening to my humble opinion and would respectfully request that if possible, we reconvene to consider a motion to rescind the previously passed motion for issue I, because it is already policy and offers nothing different. Further, that we put the remaining two motions back on the floor for a another vote. I think some of us vacillated towards the end because what each person had to offer was so moving and valuable.

This is what my spirit is telling me to offer with the understanding that we have already voted, I defer to the Chairs.

Sincerely,

Lynda Earle